

1953
Box 2

IN THE COURT OF THE TRANSPORT TRIBUNAL

TRANSPORT ACT, 1947—PART V

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF THE
BRITISH TRANSPORT COMMISSION (1953 No. 134)

TO CONFIRM THE BRITISH TRANSPORT COMMISSION (PASSENGER) CHARGES SCHEME, 1953

MONDAY, 20TH APRIL, 1953

TWENTY-FIRST DAY

Crown Copyright Reserved



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

To be purchased from

York House, Kingsway, LONDON, W.C.2	423 Oxford Street, LONDON, W.1
P.O. Box 569, LONDON, S.E.1	
13a Castle Street, EDINBURGH, 2	1 St. Andrew's Crescent, CARDIFF
39 King Street, MANCHESTER, 2	Tower Lane, BRISTOL, 1
2 Edmund Street, BIRMINGHAM, 3	80 Chichester Street, BELFAST

or from any Bookseller

1953

Price 5s. 6d. net

00609225

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TRANSPORT TRIBUNAL

MONDAY, 20th APRIL, 1953

PRESENT:

HUBERT HULL, Esq., C.B.E., (*President*)

A. E. SEWELL, Esq.

J. C. POOLE, Esq., C.B.E., M.C.

Mr. HAROLD I. WILLIS, Q.C., Mr. E. S. FAY, and Mr. KENNETH POTTER (instructed by Mr. M. H. B. Gilmour, Chief Solicitor to the British Transport Commission) appeared on behalf of the British Transport Commission.

Mr. H. V. LLOYD-JONES, Q.C., Mr. LEON MACLAREN, and Mr. GEORGE MERCER (instructed by Mr. J. G. Barr) appeared on behalf of the London County Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY LAWRENCE, Q.C., Mr. J. RAMSAY WILLIS and Mr. CHRISTOPHER HODSON and Mr. W. J. GLOVER (instructed by Sir Clifford Radcliffe, C.B.E., Solicitor and Clerk to the Middlesex County Council) appeared on behalf of the following County Councils: Middlesex, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, East Sussex, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent and Surrey.

Sir SHIRLEY WORTHINGTON-EVANS (instructed by Mr. Desmond Heap, Comptroller and City Solicitor) appeared on behalf of the Corporation of London.

Mr. J. RAMSAY WILLIS and Mr. W. J. GLOVER (instructed by Mr. W. O. Dodd, Deputy Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of Brighton Corporation.

Mr. LEON MACLAREN (instructed by Messrs. Blatchfords) appeared on behalf of the London Printing and Kindred Trades Federation.

Mr. G. R. ROUGIER (instructed by Mr. Archibald Glen, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of Southend-on-Sea Corporation.

Mr. G. R. ROUGIER appeared on behalf of County Borough of Southend-on-Sea Railway Travellers' Association.

Mr. D. J. TURNER-SAMUELS (instructed by Mr. W. H. Thompson) appeared on behalf of London Trades Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY RIPPON (instructed by Mr. R. H. Buckley, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of East Ham County Borough Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY RIPPON (instructed by Mr. G. E. Smith, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of West Ham County Borough Council.

Mr. GEOFFREY RIPPON (instructed by Mr. G. E. Smith, Town Clerk) appeared on behalf of South-West Essex Traffic Advisory Committee.

Mr. C. OSMOND TURNER (instructed by Messrs. Carpenter, Wilson & Smith) appeared on behalf of London Passengers' Association.

Mr. GERALD W. REYNOLDS represented London Federation of Trades Councils.

Miss DOROTHY D. FORSTER represented the Walthamstow Trades Council.

Mr. J. W. SYKES represented Edmonton Trades Council.

Mr. F. A. RULER represented the Federation of Residents' Associations in the County of Kent.

Mr. H. S. VIAN-SMITH represented The Association of British Chambers of Commerce.

Miss H. C. HART represented The National Association of Women Civil Servants.

Mr. N. J. LEWISOHN represented Whyteleafe & Kenley Residents' Association.

Mr. C. M. HAMILTON represented The Accountant-General's Department, Civil Service Clerical Association (Bickley Branch).

Mr. HYMAN FRANKEL represented The National Union of Bank Employees.

Mr. J. F. PLEYDELL represented Pitsea, Vange & District Resident Ratepayers' Association.

Mr. STANLEY MAYNE represented the Institution of Professional Civil Servants.

Mr. D. KELLY represented the South Essex Branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. J. E. MORRISH represented the Post Office Engineering Union.

Mr. J. REID represented the London North and London South District Committees of the Amalgamated Engineering Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER HALLIDAY represented the North London District of the Amalgamated Union of Operative Bakers, Confectioners and Allied Workers.

Mr. D. J. D. WELLUM represented the Benfleet & District Railway Travellers' Association.

Mr. S. M. NEUFELD represented the Students' Council, the Polytechnic, Regent Street.

Mr. J. MOSS represented the National Union of Furniture Trade Operatives (London District Committee).

Mrs. E. A. HUNT represented the Association of Scientific Workers (London Area Committee).

Mr. W. TROTT, representing the Amalgamated Engineering Union, Deptford, No. 2 Branch.

Mr. A. A. DRIVER, representing the Students' Union of the London School of Economics.

Mr. M. GRAHAM, representing Debden Welfare Advisory Committee.

Mr. LESLIE STANNARD representing the Deptford Trades Council.

(*President*): Mr. Willis, I said last week that we should sit late on Friday, because we had to hear a Road Haulage Appeal. I am now told that that Appeal has been withdrawn, so on Friday we shall sit at the usual time.

The other point I want to mention is this. Some days ago I said that any objector who did not propose to call witnesses—assuming that he had the right to—might either make a speech or, if he chose to reduce his observations into writing and then hand them in, those observations would be printed in the transcript of our proceedings. One of the objectors has taken that reasonable course, that is the representative of London North District Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. He has put in a written statement. I understand that a copy of it has reached the Commission. It,

and any other statements of the same sort will be printed at the end of our proceedings, so as to collect them together.

(*Mr. Willis*): If you please. Presumably copies will be sent to the Tribunal and the Commission as well as being printed.

(*President*): As I understand it, you have already got a copy of this particular one?

(*Mr. Willis*): Yes.

(*President*): Any other statements that reach us will be copied and a copy will be supplied to you, and they also will be printed at the end of the proceedings.

Now Mr. Reynolds, may I just find your objection.

(*Mr. Reynolds*): It is No. 71, Sir.

20 April, 1953]

(President): I am much obliged. This is the London Federation of Trades Council.

(Mr. Reynolds): Yes, Sir. I would like to say right from the start, on behalf of my Federation, that we do realise that a large percentage of the increases which have forced the Commission to apply to this Court for an increase in fares is outside their control. We realise that petrol, wages and salaries form quite a large proportion of their total costs. We also realise that the Executive did strive in many directions to carry out economies of various kinds, and we know that Union Branches are assisting in the carrying out of such economies, wherever possible. On the other hand, we do feel that since the end of the war a certain amount of unjustified expenditure has taken place on the London Transport system. I would like to quote one or two examples, if I may. First of all, you will notice that almost every London underground station at the moment is equipped with a loud-speaker system. I have very rarely heard any of these systems used, and yet it must have cost a considerable amount of money since the end of the war. Almost every station has a very efficient electric-sign indicator and yet this is not used. New name signs have also been put on a large number of stations, particularly on the Piccadilly line—very elaborate glass signs, whereas the old ones were quite efficient or would have been efficient, at any rate, during the present financial stringencies of the Commission.

A considerable number of changes have taken place in the design of 'bus shelters provided in the streets, whereas, as far as we could see, shelters in a reasonably good condition have been replaced by new shelters of different design—apparently part of a plan. New station barriers have been put on stations. These may be a new safety measure, but they have been put in during the last twelve months, whereas the old ones were still in good condition, as far as we could see.

(President): You mean the platform barriers?

(Mr. Reynolds): No, ticket barriers. The old ones were still in good condition and had apparently worked effectively for the last twenty years.

I have noticed in the Wood Lane Depot of the Commission that a new porters' building was erected only two and a half years ago. It must have cost approximately £2,000. Three months afterwards the yard was closed, and it has remained empty ever since. Expenditure of this kind does annoy members of my Federation when they see applications coming from the Transport Commission for increased fares. I am not saying that all of this expenditure does not improve the Commission's running efficiency, but we feel that this minor capital expenditure should be watched very carefully indeed by the Commission at a time when prices are exceedingly high, and when the Commission is having difficulty in paying its way.

You will notice in the beginning of our objection we do say that the proposed increases will cause hardship to our members. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics has recently published a Survey of Personal Income and Savings in which they have shown that 59 per cent. of the family units of this country have an income of under £400 a year and 25 per cent. of them have incomes between £400 and £600 a year. It is with the bottom section, those with a gross income of under £400 a year, that we are particularly concerned.

(President): What is meant by "family unit"?

(Mr. Reynolds): I can, if necessary, read a definition out to you.

(President): Yes.

(Mr. Reynolds): "The Income Unit is defined as follows: (1) all single persons of 18 or over, whether living alone or with other members of their family, are regarded as separate income units; if they have dependent children of their own (of under 18), as may happen in the case of widows and divorced and separated people, their children form part of their income unit; (2) married couples living together are assumed to pool their incomes and each couple is counted as a single income unit; and their children of under 18 are also included in their income unit. The only exception to these rules is made in the case of a single person of 18 or over who has no

appreciable income of his own, i.e., less than £50 a year, and who is living with relations. Such a person is assumed to be a dependent of his relations and to form part of their income unit. There were only a few cases of this sort in the sample."

(President): That is the real difficulty about taking the average income of a family unit.

(Mr. Reynolds): I quite agree. They do vary.

(President): The family unit consisting of a man and wife and three dependent children is quite a different matter from the family unit consisting of a single man with no dependants.

(Mr. Reynolds): It is indeed. It would make the position even worse, in some ways.

(President): In order, therefore, to establish the cogency of these figures one really ought to know what proportion of that 59 per cent. is represented by single men, or single women, and, indeed one would like to know in what proportion of cases the unit has dependent children and how many.

(Mr. Reynolds): I regret that I have not that information this morning, but if the Commission desires I would endeavour to obtain it and hand it in as soon as possible.

(President): The number of households used to be taken as a conventional figure when talking about minimum wages. I say "used"—I am referring to about twenty or thirty years ago. The number of households which consisted of a man and wife and three dependent children is, if my recollection of the census figures be correct, quite a small percentage of the total households in this country. The census figures for Greater London shows that the average household unit in the case of the census calculation is 2.4 persons, and that leaves very little room for the old conventional unit of man, wife and three dependent children.

(Mr. Reynolds): That has altered a great deal in the last twenty-five years, I think.

Can I give you an example of a man earning £7 a week, with two children, who will, of course, get an extra 8s. per week from family allowances. As has been pointed out to you before, the majority of people have obtained an increase in wages since January, 1952. I think you will find that the average increase is in the region of 7s. 6d. a week. A man earning £7 a week with two children would receive no income tax rebate, because he paid no tax either before the last budget or this one.

(President): You are considering the family where the wife is not working?

(Mr. Reynolds): Yes, with two children. As the result of the last Budget, with the reduction in food subsidies and increases in Family Allowances, the family would have a net loss of 4s. The fare increase of 1952 would cost the family an extra 1s. per week. Rates in 1952 and 1953 have increased tremendously in the London area, and I think, without exaggerating at all, this would have added to the family rent 1s. 6d. a week. School meals have increased, and with two children attending school taking school meals, that would mean an extra 1s. 8d. per week on the family budget. These four items added together add up to 8s. 2d., which is more than the average increase in wages which has taken place since the beginning of 1952. On top of that, coal, gas, electricity and many unsubsidised and unrationed foods have also increased in price. I do submit that in a family of this nature they have already taken the steps suggested by Mr. Willis and cut out expenditure on drink and tobacco. They have even gone further than that and cut out expenditure on entertainments such as cinemas—which, according to Cinema Owners, have suffered from lower attendances during the last two years. I would also submit that they have cut down the amount of travelling they do on London Transport Executive Lines and buses. The number of journeys originating in the London Transport Executive area last year was 4.6 per cent. below those originating in 1951. The drop started suddenly at the same time as the new Fares Scheme came into operation.

At the last inquiry a representative from the Acton Trades Council did give a quotation with regard to an apprentice and the amount it cost him to go by bus to work. That particular apprentice, and many other

20 April, 1953]

[Continued]

workers, have now given up using the London Transport Executive services and are cycling to work. I am certain that other people in the middle income groups who possess cars are finding that the fares situation has now reached a point where it is almost as cheap for them to use their cars to go to work as to use the Transport Executive services.

(President): That would be a remarkable conclusion unless more than one person was using the car, Mr. Reynolds. I have not got a car, but I think those who are fortunate enough to use a car would be surprised if they were told that travelling by themselves in their cars would be saving them money, as compared with any kind of transport service.

(Mr. Reynolds): Yes, they usually enter into an agreement with other people in the area, sharing the expense.

There is one other item to which we would like to draw attention. The majority of people, workers affiliated to our Federation, are forced to travel a considerable distance to work. We believe it is in the national interest that there should be a certain amount of mobility of labour, and we are quite certain that the high fares now being charged, which will be even higher if this application is granted, are definitely reducing the mobility of the labour force in the London area which, from a national economy point of view, cannot be anything but bad.

It is for these reasons, especially with regard to the hardship cases, that we have entered the four suggestions in our objection. We know that Lord Latham, before the opening of this Tribunal, commented on the type of suggestion made in our objection, saying that within the London area it was not feasible. We are concerned that when the Commission requires extra revenue it always takes the course of appealing to a Tribunal for an increase in fares. We have not heard—though such action may have been taken—that any approach to the Government has been made with reference to what was referred to the other day as a millstone tied round the neck of the Executive. We note that Purchase Tax has been removed during the recent Budget from Taxis. We think that the Transport Commission—especially the London Transport Executive—should make representations to the Government. Of course this may already have been done, and we feel that if it has been done the Executive should intensify their demands—

(President): I cannot allow you to pursue this line of argument much longer, Mr. Reynolds. We have made it plain, from the outset of the other Inquiries and this one, that we have no recommendation approaches to the Government or recommend the Government to do something. We must take things as they are at the moment.

(Mr. Reynolds): Yes, Sir, I appreciate what you say, but I did want to mention it, because it is the opinion of our members that the Commission only takes the one course of appealing to this Tribunal.

We are certain that part of the reduction in the number of journeys originating in the London Transport Area last year was due to the fact that housewives, people going to cinemas and meetings and so on (where it is only a short journey) have now reached the point in their personal budgets where they felt it was better to walk that short distance rather than pay the 2d. fare. Therefore we do submit that 1d. single-stage fare could be introduced in many suburban areas. It could cover a shorter distance than the 2d. fare, or I am quite certain that the Commission with their experience of the fare stages work and the use made of the different services would probably find in some areas that it would be profitable to make a 1d. fare cover the 2d. journey. Housewives going shopping would be only too pleased to ride two or three stages on their way home carrying heavy shopping; they used to do it, but at the present time they walk. Members attending evening meetings of Trade Unions and other organisations invariably walk now to get to their place of meeting, whereas at one time they could get a bus down the street on the payment of 1d.

With the cheap day facilities, at one time there were a large number of such facilities in the London Transport area. Now there are not nearly so many, and we do feel there could be an extension of such facilities, especially during the children's holidays from school. We feel that a large number of parents, in view of the high fares, are

debarred from taking their children to many of the places of historic interest in this City. Mention was made the other day of the L.C.C. Loughton Estates and the fact that parents who wanted to visit their children were faced with these high fares and just did not go. This means that the Commission is running trains and buses which, as everyone knows, during a large part of the time are more than half empty.

We think a great deal more use could be made of special concessions. I understand it is possible for a group of eight or more people by arrangement with the London Transport Executive to obtain a special cheap return fare for their party to travel within the Executive's area. I do not see why it should be eight. If it is profitable to do it for eight, would it not be just as profitable to do it for six, five or four.

(President): Or even one.

(Mr. Reynolds): Or even one. I hesitated to put it as low as that, but it is a possibility. We think that type of concession could be extended.

(President): That really amounts to saying—would it not be possible to reduce fares?

(Mr. Reynolds): Not all the time—only on special occasions when we understand the facilities are not being used to full capacity.

(President): I see—you means such as Sundays?

(Mr. Reynolds): Sundays, and week-ends. I would even go so far as to suggest that the Commission might consider a "family Sunday", where it would be possible for children to travel free of charge. With a family of two children it is too expensive for a family to go anywhere like this on Sundays. We see very good posters being put on all the underground stations, showing the places of interest in the countryside around London, and the historical places in the London area. Persons with children at the moment cannot afford, in the majority of cases, to go to these places. But if special facilities were allowed, such as taking children free of charge, say, one Sunday a month, I am quite certain that the Commission would not lose money. At least this might be tried as an experiment. If the experiment failed, then it had failed and that would be the last of it, and it would, of course, rule out any similar suggestions being put forward at any future Tribunal. The Battersea Pleasure Gardens were charging 2s. admission and found that people were not coming because, with the fares, it came to a large amount. They reduced the admission charge and increased the attendance. I am certain that if the Executive would enter into an arrangement with such people as the Pleasure Gardens, theatres, airports to give special facilities which would include the fare and attendance to the Pleasure Gardens or the airport, and many places of that kind, they would find it profitable. I am sure the London Zoo and similar places would be only too pleased to enter into an arrangement with the Executive on these lines.

There are many means of getting extra loading that my members feel the Commission could adopt, but at the moment we only find them appealing to this Tribunal for increased fares. People all over London for many years have got used to expecting good service from the London Transport Executive, and I know that to maintain that service costs a lot of money, but we would like to see more experiments being carried out by the Commission which will lead to the benefit of the people of London, enabling them to travel over the area. I believe it is common knowledge that people living in the country know more about London than the people who live in it, and that position will be exaggerated if there are still higher fares.

We are particularly concerned with item 1 of a certain section of our objection, with regard to early morning fares. The majority of people working have got to travel and the London Transport Executive knows that they have to use these services. So whatever else you may consider, Sir, in this application, I would ask you to pay special regard to that particular section. I feel that those travellers will be hit the hardest. Also I hope that the Executive will, during the coming 12 months, take more steps to reduce these on all available services. I wish to thank the Tribunal for giving me the opportunity of addressing them.

20 April, 1953]

[Continued]

(Mr. Osmond Turner): May it please you, Sir, I have two very short witnesses. Dr. Hughes is going to give evidence as to the issue of clothing in London as compared with the issue of clothing to employees of municipal transport organisations outside London. I have certain figures here, which I am not asking to put in,

but it might be of some assistance to the Tribunal if they saw these figures.

(Mr. Harold Willis): You say you are not putting these in?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): No, it is merely for the convenience of the Tribunal, that they should have copies.

Dr. LESLIE ERNEST CHARLES HUGHES, sworn.

Examined by Mr. OSMOND TURNER.

6933. Your full name, Dr. Hughes, is Leslie Ernest Charles Hughes?—That is correct.

6934. And you live at 15, Avenue House, Aleeson Road, N.W.8?—Yes, correct.

6935. You are, I believe, a Ph.D. Engineering of London University, and you are familiar with statistical methods?—To a large extent, yes, but I am not a specialist in statistics.

6936. Have you examined a series of original letters from eight municipal transport authorities to the London Passengers' Association?—I have, they are here.

6937. Do they give details of clothing issues to the different drivers, conductors and conductresses in the area covered by these local authorities?—Yes, except for Blackpool. They just give a general statement.

6938. (President): What is Dr. Hughes' present occupation?—I am an engineer, travelling across London, in intimate contact with the subject under discussion.

6939. I do not quite follow that. It may not be important.—My exact position, I think, is irrelevant, but I am a professional engineer.

6940. A consultant?—I work for a firm, yes.

6941. You know about engineering and you travel in London?—Yes, that is so.

6942. (Mr. Osmond Turner): For the purposes of the record, these municipal transport authorities are Blackpool, Birmingham, Bournemouth, Cardiff, Glasgow, Manchester and Portsmouth?—Yes, and also the London Transport Executive which we have obtained from other documents, not from letters.

6943. You have been supplied with details of the London Transport issues of clothing during 1950-51 and 1951-52?—That is correct.

6944. For the purposes of this comparison, I think you have ignored certain issues, have you not?—Yes, there were small things like caps, cap covers, collars and ties, which are in some instances issued, that we thought were such small items that they could not be compared with the much larger ones.

6945. And you have dealt with the main garments?—Yes, that is correct; they are overcoats, mackintoshes, tunics, dust-coats, trousers, skirts and slacks.

6946. For the purposes of the comparison between London and the provinces, how have you dealt with these units of clothing?—In analysing the letters we thought the best way was to allocate the issue for each of the drivers, conductors and conductresses per annum. That is to say, if issued with one in two years we credited them with one half per annum, and then we added it up as all garments. We could not get the economics of the matter because we could not value the items. Also the financial statements do not admit analysis of the details.

6947. So this is a pure "garment for garment" comparison?—Yes, the best we could do in the circumstances.

6948. How have you treated it where the issue is optional, where you may choose a coat or a mackintosh?—We treated them the same. In the particular case of Birmingham there was an overcoat and a mackintosh every three years for bus drivers. For conductors it was an overcoat or a mackintosh. So we differentiated between those two in the statement by crediting the driver with the use of one third of a coat per year, and the conductors and conductresses with one half of that.

6949. One sixth?—Yes.

6950. Did you then calculate the average issue of garments per person in each of the municipal enterprises?—Yes.

6951. And for London in the period 1950-51 and 1951-52?—Yes. These two periods were necessary because there happened to be a change between those years.

6952. Did you calculate the average issue of garments per person taking the whole of the provinces as a whole?—Yes.

6953. Did you then calculate the average issue of each class of garment per person per year of London over the provinces?—That is correct; that is expressed both as a fraction and as a percentage.

6954. What is the result of your calculations, garment for garment, in giving a comparison between London and the provinces. Is London up or down on the provinces?—In general London is considerably up.

6955. Can you give us a figure?—There is a slight difficulty but that is taken into account, because in London mackintoshes are not issued. On a garment to garment basis overcoats, for example, the figures were up by 35 per cent., but if you include mackintoshes as equal to overcoats the Londoners are not quite so well off. But on all other major items they are considerably up. In fact, the total average of London over the provinces, the average of the averages for each item, amounts to no less than 33 per cent.

6956. Have you another figure here of 48 per cent.?—That 48 per cent is the average of garments as such; that is, if you disregard mackintoshes, because Londoners do not get mackintoshes, and if you disregard skirts, because conductresses in London do not get skirts, they get slacks. If you disregard that, they are 48 per cent. up on the provinces, but if you take mackintoshes as equal to coats, and skirts to slacks in the provinces the figure is reduced to 33 per cent. Londoners get 33 per cent. more garments on the average than their opposite numbers in the provinces.

6957. Could we take just one more comparison—taking one of the Northern towns—perhaps Glasgow—how do the clothes issued in Glasgow for each of the three classes of employment, compare with the issues in London for 1951-52?—There is a very considerable disparity. The drivers in Glasgow get two units of garments, and the conductors and conductresses 2.17, whereas at present in London the drivers get 3.50, conductors 4.00 and conductresses 3.50 units, which makes us more than 50 per cent.—perhaps 60 per cent.—more.

6958. Thank you very much. Now just a word as to Blackpool last of all. What is the position there?—The letter was rather brief and did not give details, but there was actual uniform issued, and when new uniforms are issued the old ones must be returned. They take off the buttons and sell the garments to scrap material merchants; the last price was £2 per cwt. I think if that was worked out for London there would be a considerable revenue from salvage of used uniforms.

(President): But is not the London uniform returnable?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): It is returnable, but there is no figure for it, as far as I can gather, in the accounts.

(President): I should think it is deducted.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I will not press that. It is not one of my main contentions, Sir.

(President): It cannot be a contention at all, Mr. Turner, main or otherwise, unless we know the conditions in London.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): If you please. Thank you, Mr. Hughes.

20 April, 1953]

DR. LESLIE ERNEST CHARLES HUGHES

[Continued]

Cross-examined by Mr. HAROLD WILLIS.

6959. You are a Doctor of Engineering?—I am a Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering.

6960. How did you come to interest yourself in these clothing statistics?—It was one item in a large number that we concentrated on when we tried to see possible economies in the London Transport Executive.

6961. You say "we". Are you a member of the London Passenger Association?—That is correct.

6962. How many other members are there?—I do not know.

6963. Do you not?—I said so.

6964. But have you no idea? Are there 100?—Certainly a hundred. I do not know the exact figure.

6965. Have you not interested yourself in the growth of this Association?—I do not know that that is relevant at all.

6966. How long have you been a member, Dr. Hughes?—Two years.

6967. Can I ask you what the subscription is?—Half a crown, or five shillings—half a crown, I think.

6968. Do you know if any other witness is going to give a little more information about the Association?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I think not.

6969. (Mr. Harold Willis): You have not concerned yourself with the numbers. Would I be right if I said there are only 200 or 300 of them?—About right, I expect.

6970. Have you got offices?—A Registered address, I think.

6971. But no office?—We cannot afford a large organisation.

6972. I am only asking questions.—But I must give a sensible reply. I do not expect that passengers of London can afford to run an office.

6973. (President): Will you confine yourself to answering questions, please. It is not part of your office to excite an argument. If you think a question is unreasonable will you ask me if you are bound to answer it?—Very well.

6974. (Mr. Harold Willis): I think we have explored the Association sufficiently, Dr. Hughes. As far as these statistics are concerned, I notice that three or four times you used these words "London is higher than the provinces", or "taking the provinces as a whole". Was that a fair way of putting the provinces?—I thought so.

6975. Because what you have in fact done, as I understand it from the documents, is to bring out six or seven provincial centres where there are transport undertakings, and from the statistics obtained from these seven undertakings you have said London is higher than the provinces as a whole?—Yes.

6976. How many transport undertakings are there in the aggregate in the provinces?—I have no idea—probably a hundred.

6977. Are you a statistician?—No.

6978. But you have taken an interest in statistics?—Certainly.

6979. Would you regard a comparison between London and the provinces statistically to be fairly put forward if

you take out of a hundred provincial undertakings, seven?—These are major ones, and therefore I do consider it is a cross-section.

6980. You would regard that as statistically sound?—Not necessarily completely statistically sound, but a very good representation of what we are talking about.

6981. I do not know whether you have considered this aspect of the matter. What is the average cost of garments per issue to drivers and conductors?—I have no idea.

6982. Would it surprise you—the figures have been given to me—if I say that taking Glasgow, Birmingham, Manchester and Cardiff the annual cost of issue is £21 11s. 6d., whereas in London the equivalent figure for central services is £21 18s. 3d. Does that suggest to you any very serious disparity in the clothing issue?—I would want to check it up with the garments, of course.

6983. Is not the cost the really crucial point?—But surely if they have more garments in London and the figures are the same, then if they had less garments, to correspond with the provinces, a considerable saving would be made.

6984. As you asking the Tribunal to form the conclusion from your evidence that the London issues are extravagant?—It is not for me to do that, but the facts should be taken into account in approaching the matter from an economic point of view.

6985. Your evidence, as I understand it, is directed to this—to trying to suggest to this Tribunal that there is in London a source of economy which the London Transport Executive have ignored?—Yes, correct.

6986. Therefore, you are suggesting that there is an extravagance in the clothing issues in London?—That is your word.

6987. Do you suggest that?—Yes, of course, I do.

6988. What number of overcoats do you, with your philosophical experience, suggest should be given to the driver in London. How often should he have his overcoat?—I have no idea.

6989. But you are saying he ought to have the garments less frequently that he in fact has.—I am merely putting forward facts gathered from all over the country which suggest economies. I am not an expert to decide on these matters.

6990. You know nothing whatever about bus clothing?—Do you?

6991. (President): Really, Dr. Hughes, if you want your evidence to impress us you must behave in the way in which witnesses are expected to behave.—And Counsel, Sir.

6992. (Mr. Harold Willis): Let me ask the question again, Dr. Hughes. I, of course, ask the questions politely, as I am sure you have already appreciated. You are not an expert on clothing?—Not on transport clothing.

6993. Are you merely basing your argument that London Transport Executive is extravagant on the fact that there are certain differences in the scale of issue as between London and certain of the provincial undertakings shown on this list?—Yes.

6994. Thank you.

Re-examined by Mr. OSMOND TURNER.

6995. Just two questions, Dr. Hughes. My learned friend asked about the membership of the Association. Do you know also that besides regular members of the Association there are a number of Associations which are members of the Association?—That is the position.

(Mr. Harold Willis): He did not really seem to know anything about it.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): May I just put it to him?

(Mr. Harold Willis): Not if he does not know.

(President): Let him ask it, because all the information we can get about the Association will be useful.

6996. (Mr. Osmond Turner): Do you know if there are, besides individuals who are members of the London Pas-

sengers' Association, associations who are also members of the Association itself?—That is correct; we are associated with other associations?

6997. And what is the membership of those other organisations?

6998. (President): What are these other associations?—I would rather an official statement be put in from the Secretary. I would only be guessing.

6999. (Mr. Osmond Turner): You cannot help us?—Not at the moment.

Thank you.

(The Witness retired.)

20 April, 1953]

[Continued]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE, SWORN

Examined by Mr. OSMOND TURNER.

7000. Is your full name Cyril Edward Pocknee?—Yes.

7001. Of St. Mary's Vicarage, Edmonton, London, N.18?—That is right.

7002. Are you Clerk in Holy Orders benefited at St. Mary's Vicarage, Edmonton?

7003. Have you been since 1948 Chairman of the North London Travelling Facilities Campaign?—That is correct.

7004. That is a Campaign comprising a number of Associations?—That is so.

7005. The Associations are, I think, the Federation of Enfield Ratepayer & Resident Associations, Weir Hall & District Ratepayers' Association, Crest Drive & Roedean Avenue Residents' Association, St. Albidge and District Ratepayers' Association, Grove Estate Residents' Association, Tottenham & Wood Green Burial Board, Unity Residents' Association, Enfield & District Works Athletic & Social Clubs Association, Cheshunt & District Residents' Association, Edmonton Residents' Alliance, Chingford Ratepayers' Association, Longfield Estate Residents' Association, Moat House Residents' Association, Woodgrange Residents' Association, Aylands Residents' Association, North Enfield Residents' Association, Neword Residents' Association, Ponders End Ratepayers' Association, Brookside Residents' Association, Sunny Estates Residents' Society, Western Enfield Residents' Association, West Green Ratepayers' Association. Those are the Associations which comprise your Campaign?—That is correct.

7006. (President): Mr. Pocknee cannot be a member of all those Associations, surely?—No, I am not a member of those Associations—they are an affiliated body to my Committee.

7007. (Mr. Osmond Turner): They are all affiliated?—Yes.

7008. And is your Campaign affiliated to the London Passengers' Association?—That is so.

7009. How many members do they have?—About 30,000.

7010. Are you also a member of the Edmonton Borough Travel Facilities Committee?—Yes.

7011. That is a Committee of the Local Authority?—Sub-Committee of the Local Authority.

7012. (President): What is the meaning of the statement that your Campaign represents 30,000 people? Does that mean that these various associations in the aggregate have a membership of 30,000?—That is so.

7013. (Mr. Poole): Are they all affiliated to the London Passengers' Association?—Through my Campaign, not individually, not to the separate Associations.

7014. I do not quite follow.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): The London Passengers' Association, as I understand it, have a provision in their constitution for admission to the member-Associations who have much the same interests as the London Passengers' Association, and the North London Travelling Facilities Campaign has been admitted, so to speak, as a member.

(Mr. Poole): The Campaign cannot be an entity, can it?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): As I understand it, the word is being used in that sense.

(Mr. Willis): Do they get 2s. 6d. for each of the 30,000?

(President): The position is that the Campaign is a member of your Client, the London Passengers' Association.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That is as I understand it.

(President): And the various Associations are bodies which are associated with the Campaign?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That is correct.

(Mr. Poole): Mr. Pocklee is Chairman of the North London Travelling Facilities Association?—Travelling Facilities Campaign.

7015. Not Association, I see.

7016. (President): When did this Campaign open?—In 1948.

7017. (Mr. Osmond Turner): What are the objects of the Campaign?—The objects of the Campaign are to

co-ordinate the widespread dissatisfaction that is felt in our area in regard to the services that are offered by the London Transport Executive and the London Lines of British Railways, and for which it seems that we are to be asked to pay ever-increasing fares.

7018. (President): How often does the Campaign meet?—We have no fixed meetings, but it meets approximately once in two months.

7019. (Mr. Osmond Turner): Did you about four years ago, as Chairman of the Campaign, go to see the Local Authority and the Chamber of Commerce at Tottenham?—That is so.

7020. Can you tell us what happened?—It was in regard to an extension of the bus service down White Hart Lane and Northumberland Park to service a large factory area which was far off the main road. Subsequently this service was refused by the London Transport Executive on the grounds that it would not be an economic proposition and that their traffic statistics supported this. After a considerable amount of negotiation the Chamber of Commerce decided they would run a free bus service for their employees in this area, and the London Transport Executive were informed. Shortly afterwards they instituted the service that had been requested in the first place. Since then this service has had to be augmented.

7021. As a matter of interest, does this bus route or the extension of it pass a football ground?—No, it does not.

7022. It is purely to serve that factory area?—That is so. It also serves the normal residents of the area as well.

7023. Did a similar situation arise in the Borough of Edmonton?—Yes, a similar situation has arisen in the Borough of Edmonton where we have requested a similar kind of service to serve a large new housing area and a factory area, where some people have to walk as far as one mile to the main road. No service has been provided although there is adequate traffic to support this new service. The service has been requested by the Local Authority as well as my Committee, and it has also the support of the local Chamber of Commerce. There is unanimous support in the whole of the Borough, but it has been refused in fact.

7024. Is there, in your view, any loss of traffic through that service not being instituted?—I should say there is a very considerable loss of possible traffic.

7025. Has any consideration been given to the running of a local service free, or in any other way?—That is being explored by the Chamber of Commerce and by the other people in the area.

(President): Whereabouts is this unserved road?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Do you mean the unserved road in Edmonton?

(President): Yes.

7026. (Mr. Osmond Turner): Can you tell us where it is proposed it should run?—What is called Cuckoo Hall Road—a new housing estate—and then round Montagu Road Factory area.

(President): I meant by reference to the existing route. We have the map here of the existing route—I cannot see where it is.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Unfortunately I have not one of those route maps.

(Mr. Harold Willis): We can identify this, because we are familiar with this request, and it can be drawn on your map.

(President): Thank you.

7027. (Mr. Osmond Turner): No doubt my learned friend will deal with that matter. Now may we move to the position on the East end of the Piccadilly line during off-peak hours. Have you had any representations about that in your Campaign?—Yes, we have—particularly since last October when the custom of running short trains during the off-peak periods was instituted. I know from personal experience and from complaints received by members of my Committee that the term "off peak" period is now coming to have no meaning, because people are standing almost all the time. It is

20 April, 1953]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE

[Continued]

impossible to go to any other car down the platform, because the time allowed for opening and shutting the doors is so short.

7028. You say since last October?—I mean the inconvenience to the public seems to have increased since last October.

7029. You do not know the precise date when this arrangement came into force?—Yes.

7030. A general question last of all, Mr. Pocknee. What is the position in your area now as to services and as to potential traffic which is not being catered for, if there is any?—Well, I would say a great deal of traffic in our area is not being catered for, and that the services are inadequate. I use that term advisedly because in the Central Transport Consultative Committee for Great Britain Annual Report, there is a specific reference to our area in paragraph 27, which I would like to quote.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Have you that before you, Sir.

7031. (President): Yes. What page?—It is page 8, paragraph 27. "For many years passenger transport facilities between North London dormitory areas and the City has been seriously inadequate and at peak hours the facilities, whether road, tube or surface railways are insufficient to cope with the traffic."

7032. (President): Is that all you are going to quote from that paragraph?—Yes, that is all I intend to quote.

7033. It would be a little unfair to stop there, would it not? The second paragraph explains why the improvement suggested by the Working Party has not been carried out.

7034. (Mr. Osmond Turner): Would you read the next portion?—"This was realised by the Minister of Transport, who in 1944 set up a Working Party to consider the problem, and in their report of February, 1949, they recommended twelve schemes for the improvement of London passenger traffic, three of which (Schemes C, D and M) applied to North London. The Working Party advised that these three schemes should be carried out with the highest priority."

Cross-examined by Mr. HAROLD WILLIS.

7041. I have very few questions. Your Campaign, as I understand it, is a member of the London Passengers' Association?—Yes, that is correct.

7042. I do not know whether you have seen the literature of the Association themselves? You probably have when you became a member?—Yes.

7043. Do they say in their little pamphlet that the Association first started in 1945, long before the London Transport Executive and the Nationalisation of Railways was in the air, and that the improvement in travel conditions since the Association came into being can largely be attributed to its existence. Is that your view—that the traffic improvements in London can be credited to the London Passengers' Association?—I should not go so far as to say that. I think that is an exaggerated claim.

7044. You referred to a particular route in Edmonton. I have had it marked on the road map. Perhaps someone would just hand this up. We need not take very long on this. It is inked in—that is the route you were talking about, is it not?—The proposed route, yes. I would say the actual route is tentative.

7045. Yes, but it is thereabouts?—Yes.

7046. And is the fact this—that a number of census were taken at certain selected points—did you know that—by the London Transport Executive?—I was aware that some were taken, yes.

7047. And did you know that the Transport Users Consultative Committee considered it?—Yes.

7048. And they did not think the service was justified?—That is so.

7049. Well, so much for that particular route. Then you raised a few questions in regard to the Piccadilly line. What you are in effect saying as I understand it is this—that the off-peak services on the Piccadilly line are really as crowded as the peak services?—Yes.

7035. (President): Yes, now the next paragraph.—"In 1950 we were asked by bodies representing the residents in North London to press for the introduction of the improvements recommended by the Working Party."

7036. (President): Who is "we"?—My Committee and the Local Authority. "We ascertained from the Commission that with certain modifications Schemes C, D and M met with their approval and that they desired to introduce the new facilities as quickly as possible but the financial restrictions imposed by the Treasury prevented a start being made. Since 1940 the North London Travelling Facilities Campaign, a body representing twenty-two Ratepayers' and Residents' Associations, have continually sought our aid, and from time to time we have emphasised both to the Minister and the Commission the urgent need for these improvements. In October of this year we minuted the inability . . ."

7037. (President): "That the inability . . ."—Yes, " . . . that the inability of the Ministry of Transport to obtain Treasury sanction for these essential works was causing great dissatisfaction and urged their introduction without further delay."

7038. Do you not think that last sentence ought to have been quoted without my asking you to read it?—I do not know. It raises another issue if I may mention it. We have asked for temporary relief in that area from the London Transport Executive, and it has been refused.

7039. (President): Never mind that. You were giving in evidence a statement in the Report of this Committee and you read out that first sentence. Do you not think—thinking it over—that it would have been better if, without any pressure from me, you had read out the sentence on the explanation why the Schemes C, D, and M. cannot be carried out? Because the Treasury sanction cannot be obtained for the capital expenditure?—I was not referring to a solution of this problem. It is not for me to propose solutions.

7040. I think if you read from a public document that everyone has not got, it would be better to read not merely the existence of a complaint but also the reason why that complaint is continued. However, now we can pass from that.

7050. I do not know whether you have heard the evidence at this inquiry to this effect—that with a view to economy trains have been shortened in the off-peak periods and running with greater frequency?—I have not heard the evidence here, no.

7051. Would it be the view of your Campaign that London Transport Executive should introduce economies wherever possible?—Most certainly, but I would maintain this is not an economy but an irritation to the public.

7052. You would prefer that the trains should remain their full length in off-peak periods, run in the way they used to?—That is so.

7053. With the resulting additional further loss of the saving so effected?—I do not know. I have no evidence that there is any saving.

7054. You did refer to this point, that people do not have time to go down the platform to get on to the less crowded part of the train. You said there is not time for moving down the platform?—That is so.

7055. It depends how long they are on the platform waiting for the train, does it not? People are rather like a lot of sheep sometimes, and will stick in one point on the platform although they may have to stand in more coaches, while at the front or back of the train there are vacant seats?—With these shortened trains you do not know where along the platform they are going to stop. They do not cover the whole length. People may be standing where the train is not going to be.

7056. Is there any very serious difficulty for anyone standing to get out of the crowded coach at the next stop and move to the front or back of the train where there are vacant seats?—There is not time.

7057. You are not suggesting that there is not time to step out of one coach and move along the platform to the next?—I would say there is not, particularly when the train is very crowded. You just cannot get out in time.

20 April, 1953]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE

[Continued]

7058. This Campaign has its meetings from time to time—once every two months you said? Who attends the meetings?—The delegates of the Organisation.

7059. Of which you are the Chairman?—Yes.

7060. (President): How many people were there at the last meeting?—I should say about 30.

7061. And the meeting before that?—I have no recollection. I cannot say.

7062. The last meeting was about two months ago?—In January.

7063. And the meeting before that?—About October. I shall be having one actually this Thursday.

Re-examined by Mr. OSMOND TURNER.

7064. You have told us in cross-examination that you are aware that it has been recommended that there should not be such a service as you have recommended through your Campaign in the Edmonton area?—That is so.

7065. From knowledge of local conditions, what is your view. Do you still feel there should be or should not be one?—I certainly feel this bus service should be instituted and as a matter of fact a petition is being issued by the residents of the Borough to that effect.

7066. You told us, I think, early on in examination in chief, that some people are nearly one mile from any form of transport?—That is so.

7067. Coming back to the Piccadilly line, I think you said that you have noticed these over-crowded conditions?—Yes.

7068. You did not say these conditions had existed since uncoupling started?—I do not think I stated that.

7069. But since October?—Yes, that is my observation and the complaint that my Committee have received.

7070. And, of course, as to the matter of walking along the platform to some other car, one has not much alternative if there are only three cars?—Yes.

(Mr. Harold Willis): Three cars?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Three other cars.

May it please you, Sir. I decided to be as short as I can in this matter. What I am trying to do to-day is to put to the Tribunal the view of the London passenger as seen through the London Passengers' Association and the many other Associations which are affiliated with it. I am not concerned to-day so much with the detail of finance, which other of my learned friends have been dealing with, but must look at it from the point of view of the man who is paying the pennies which the Commission are asking for at this Tribunal. In other words, the point of view of the man who has little knowledge of technicalities, joint cost and so on, but travels round with his eyes open.

One comes, I think, to two main conclusions. One, that the Commission was no doubt very desirous of effecting savings but is not looking so much to the benefit of the public, and thinks if it looks rather more to the pennies the pounds will help to look after themselves.

The other thing which strikes one is that the Commission is not seeking as they should be seeking to gain new traffic by new services, or by off-peak cheap fares. I have only to-day brought two witnesses before this Tribunal, because I was anxious to save time, two out of the many who were available to me, and I have called them with a view to trying to high-light those two particular conclusions.

I might refer to another matter which has arisen in the course of cross-examination of the Commission's witnesses. It has always of course been the contention of my clients that Londoners should get some benefit or some advantage from the very heavy freight traffic which there is in this country outside of the London area, and to some extent inside the London area so far as London lines are concerned. It would seem that the policy of integration, which many people thought when the 1947 Transport Act was put into effect would mean true integration of the transport throughout the country from every point of view, has not been practised or carried into effect on a national basis. When I suggested to Sir Reginald Wilson that there might be some bolster or advantage to the London area from the revenues resulting from the freight outside, he thought, and in fact he told me, that that would produce what I think he called "the boneless wonder".

(President): Mr. Turner, what is the exact meaning of the suggestion that London should get some advantages from the freight services outside London?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): It proceeds, Sir, upon the assumption that the freight services outside of London are

very profitable and that the Londoner has to pay for freight through the cost of the article which he buys, which is very expensive in the shops. The man outside London gets some advantages because his passenger service is being to some extent subsidised by the profits from freight outside of London, and that position does not obtain inside London.

(President): I could understand the argument if the London transport ordinary fare were higher than the ordinary fare on Railway Executive lines outside London. Do your clients desire that the ordinary fares on London Transport should be 1½d.?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I am not sure I entirely follow that.

(President): I gather you think in London passengers are being badly treated in comparison with passengers outside London.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That is so.

(President): Then if that were so one would expect to find, would one not, that the ordinary fares charged to passengers inside London would be higher than the ordinary fares charged to passengers outside London?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): If there were some subsidies from the profits outside London, this fare increase would not have had to be asked for.

(President): If someone will provide some more money from some other source it will not be necessary to draw any more money from this particular source.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Those are the views which I am instructed to put forward. The question of cost, of course, is a complicated one, and it is very difficult to get a true picture of what the real profitability of passenger traffic against freight traffic is outside London, but the present demand from London alone is for £6m., and only £3m. is being asked for from the provinces. It would seem to follow from that that it is unlikely that freight traffic is unprofitable outside the London area. It is felt, as I have already said, that the Londoner is paying the cost of his article for the freight charges, but that he is getting no advantage from any of the profit which is being made from freight.

It is known, and the matter was raised in cross-examination of Mr. Valentine, that ways and structures on the London Transport Executive lines are very costly indeed, particularly signalling, and on the whole the cost of ways and structures is probably a good deal higher than those on steam lines, and the train frequency is probably the greatest in the world on London Transport Executive lines. At the same time, the fares are basically the same on both the London Transport Executive lines and on London lines, and if this Scheme is confirmed then passenger transport or passenger traffic will be paying for the whole of the heavy costs of that on London Transport Executive lines. If, as I am instructed it is, the passenger traffic on the London lines is as heavy as it is on the London Transport Executive lines, and there is a very substantial freight traffic, it would seem to follow from that that on the London lines, at any rate, the passenger traffic is paying for the greater proportion, and that therefore freight is running probably rather cheaply over those lines.

The feeling of my clients is that in all these matters London is getting rather a raw deal as compared with the rest of the country.

(President): You know, feeling is one thing; calculations are another. I gather what you are suggesting, whether it be a matter of feeling or a matter for analysis, is that the figures put before us as to the true working costs of London lines are wrong, and that in fact the working costs are less.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That broadly is what is being put forward. It is not being suggested for one moment

20 April, 1953]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE

[Continued]

that the figures have been put forward in order to mislead the Tribunal, but rather that it is a question of the rather arbitrary nature of the joint costing which is involved.

(President): It is a difficult calculation and everyone who has spoken about it has admitted that there is a very large margin of possible error both ways. Are you going to favour us on behalf of the Association with any examination of the figures as to the true working costs of the London lines passenger services, or are you content to rely on what has been urged on behalf of the Middlesex and other County Councils?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Largely speaking that is what we are relying upon, and it is felt that at any rate it is very difficult to make a true analysis in that case because in many cases, especially so far as terminal costs and so on are concerned, it is very difficult to come to an appreciation of what the costs should be.

If I might, Sir, just for one moment come to the question of uncoupling, what is being put forward there is that first of all the public were told that there would be shorter trains and they would be run with a greater frequency, and that would result in some saving of cost although not very great. Then when certain trains were introduced in October of last year, we find that the frequency is also reduced.

(Mr. Harold Willis): Frequency has been increased— $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 minutes, I think.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): No, with respect, $2\frac{1}{2}$ minutes, then it went to 3 minutes. First of all shorter trains were introduced and the frequency, I think I have a note of it, from $3\frac{1}{2}$ minutes went to $2\frac{1}{2}$ minutes; then in October of last year the frequency went from $2\frac{1}{2}$ minutes to 3 minutes.

(Mr. Harold Willis): It did not go right back.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): No, not by any means right back, but it was going that way perhaps. But it is from that point I am instructed that the position became very difficult in off-peak hours. The sort of thing Mr. Pocknee has told the Tribunal about, one gets the effect of the peak hours being extended over what were originally regarded as the peak hours; in other words, London is being asked to take a worse service at a greater cost, and the effect of all that is, so far as possible, to drive people away from London Transport Executive transport.

When faced with this position, and I dealt with in cross-examination of Mr. Valentine, all the Commission have to say about that is that people are too lazy to walk from one car to another; and yet there are the figures, quite clearly showing, that in October the frequency started to creep down again from $2\frac{1}{2}$ minutes to 3 minutes. The only answer which I was given when I dealt with this with Sir Reginald Wilson was that London is always prepared to pay an even greater price rather than to walk or to go by taxi. That is felt by my clients to be the wrong approach to the matter.

It has always, I am told, been an axiom of passenger travel, and obvious, that where the profit is there the traffic lies. It is just a question of finding out how to tap it. The greatest traffic of all undoubtedly is in London, and I am instructed that in the old days before the war London was always rather regarded as a happy hunting ground by the former railway companies, because of the profitability of the traffic in the London area.

It seems to my clients that the Transport Commission is bound by a number of theories, the first and most unfortunate one being perhaps that London will always pay. But I am really referring to such matters as very long bus routes, going from one side of London to the other, and going through the central area, and the fact that off-peak cheap rates do not bring extra traffic, as it is admitted that they do, or that cheap rates do, in the provinces. The view that I am putting forward so far as London bus routes are concerned is that if you have a central area where the traffic is congested and very uncertain, then the answer is to do as is done I believe in many Continental capitals. You shunt your buses backwards and forwards as fast as possible in the central areas, as fast as it is possible to do it, then you feed your routes from the centre.

(President): It is easy enough to talk in general terms. Have you a particular example of a particular route in mind to explain to me?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): No, I have not; I am putting forward the general theory.

(President): Let me understand what it means. Let us imagine a long bus route—we will not take a particular one—which starts, if you like, at Hammersmith, which goes through Piccadilly, the Strand and the City, and then goes beyond to some place on the North-East, what does your suggestion mean? Does it mean that bus should run as far as Mansion House and then discharge its cargo there and turn back, and that another bus should be waiting at Mansion House to take those passengers, or such as are left, to the North-East?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Something of that kind. I would not say where the points of discharge should be, but the sort of thing which is being done in South London is that buses are running to Victoria and back again, and then people have to find their own way across the central area.

(President): You mean a break in journeys and a new bus route starting at whatever be the point of break?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Yes, and that the bus services within the centre should have a great deal more flexibility in time and running, and should run—

(President): I do not understand what you mean when you say the buses in the central area. Do you mean by the central area the City of London or something much bigger?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I am thinking particularly of the West End and the City, and that sort of area.

(President): Then those buses are to have a greater flexibility of what?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): A greater flexibility of timetable.

(President): Do you mean the bus driver should have choice of time he takes?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): His instructions should be to get across as quickly as he can, bearing in mind the conditions of traffic.

(President): Then it should be left to him, you mean, and he should just be told to get from Liverpool Street to Victoria as quickly as possible?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): With Inspectors and Supervisors on the route.

(President): You mean they should be there at particular times as he is passing?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That is for the Commission. I am putting the broad general principle.

(President): Really, Mr. Turner, broad general principle is no good. It amounts to the suggestion that they should get the buses to move as quickly as possible; everyone agrees. The difficulty is to get the practical application.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): We heard from Mr. Valentine that there would be an enormous saving if they ran one mile an hour faster. That is the principle.

(President): That is the object of the principle.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I am putting forward the suggestion that if there were not these long bus routes the feeder would be able to run with greater regularity and a good deal faster.

(Mr. Poole): We were informed that some of the worst places of congestion were outside the central area.

(Mr. Harold Willis): I think the fair way of putting it is that by and large the central area is worse, but there are places outside the central area where you do find just as bad conditions as in the central area.

(Mr. Poole): Croydon was mentioned as one of them, if I remember rightly.

(President): For my part up to the present I do not understand how you are going to reduce congestion by breaking a route of one bus at, what I have suggested, Mansion House, and having another bus on the North-Eastern area from there.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I am not suggesting you are to reduce congestion, but your feeder routes can run with greater regularity and greater speed.

(President): I do not understand at the moment why you say that what you call the feeder route would run at greater speed.

20 April, 1953]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE

[Continued]

(Mr. Sewell): Would it not also involve the passengers in re-booking every time they are transhipped, which would mean more money being spent on fares?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That is a possibility. All I am putting forward really is that this problem of the central area needs a greater flexibility of approach, and some sort of system such as the system which is being used in continental capitals with success is worth investigation.

(President): I cannot really accept a general statement from the London Passengers' Association that such and such a system is being used in continental capitals and should be adopted, without greater precision.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): I mean in Paris, for instance.

(President): We should be quite willing to go and examine the situation, at any rate in the more pleasant continental capitals!

(Mr. Osmond Turner): Perhaps some circuit system for this Tribunal would be an excellent thing. However, the Londoners feel that no real attempt is being made to attract fresh and additional traffic in the London area and economies on these small items should be made. Mr. Pocknee's evidence of the difficulty of getting new services seems to point in that direction.

I am instructed to say that my clients feel that the London Transport Executive should be pursuing as urgently as possible fresh fields of London passenger traffic; that in some cases they are out of touch with local trends and local conditions; and that they ought to start new services when the traffic exists, and if possible bring in cheap off-peak rates. We have heard something about getting the housewife into the West End and so forth, that sort of thing, and that every attempt should be made to economise on small matters such as clothing, about which Dr. Hughes gave some evidence.

I am instructed to say that the municipal transport undertakings which were examined were taken completely at random, except of course an eye was had to the larger units rather than the smaller ones. All that is being said here to-day is that it would appear from those figures that the clothing issue in London is greater than it tends to be in provincial centres, and even there some slight economy, with the assistance of the staff, should be made.

(President): The comparison surely must be between costs and not between articles.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): We have no knowledge of the costs, but from what my learned friend Mr. Willis says, the costs in Glasgow and London are apparently much the same. In Clement Place, Glasgow, the issue is much smaller than it is here, and one would presume it might be reasonable to make a rather smaller issue here, and the costs would be even greater because what appears to come out of that statement is that the London Transport Executive is buying clothing much more cheaply than the municipal enterprise can.

There are only two other matters upon which I want to touch, very briefly; they are suggestions for the way in which small savings could be made, small savings which in the submission of my clients could add up to substantial savings in the long run, such things as advertising, for example. We are well aware that the British Transport Commission had something said to it some time ago by the Central Consultative Committee for not employing good Public Relations Officers, but we feel that they have gone too much in the opposite direction, and that large-scale advertising about the courtesy of the queue and how to travel on escalators, in view of the enormous advertising costs in the modern Press is the sort of thing which ought to be cut down. That is the sort of thing which the average Londoner sees as he goes around as he is being asked to pay his pennies for the additional fares.

Mr. Valentine told us on the 13th day that the London Transport Executive would very much like to see standing allowed in the off-peak hours. I would say to that: Why can we not have eight people standing in the rush hours? If you are going to have five people in the gangways it is no more difficult from the point of view of collection of fares to have eight people standing, and that would enable a certain number of buses to be taken off the road altogether.

(Mr. Poole): Would you not have to convince the Unions on this subject?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): My instructions are that the Unions will always co-operate as far as they can, and Mr. Valentine said he would take every opportunity of putting that view forward.

(President): Surely it is a matter of common knowledge that the difficulty is the Union objection. The mere assurance by the London Passenger Association that if it was put nicely eight standing would be graciously approved by the Union is really of no assistance to us. What does the London Passenger Association know about the attitude of the Union?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): All I would say is that we have heard nothing here about any attempt on the part of the British Transport Commission to get this point agreed with the Unions, and there ought to have been some attempt of that kind. Mr. Valentine said he would seek to put that view forward at a suitable time, whereas the view of this Association is that that should have been put forward with some force.

(Mr. Poole): You do not know that it has not been?

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That was the impression I got from Mr. Valentine's evidence, but I would not wish to press that matter. I do not want to take up any more of the Tribunal's time, nor do I think I could assist in any other way.

(President): After all, Mr. Turner, the London Passengers' Association, if they feel the Union would readily agree with eight standing passengers, might occupy themselves in obtaining the support of the local branches to that proposal.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): That point of view will be put before them.

(President): It could be put on the Agenda of the next meeting.

(Mr. Osmond Turner): The only other matter upon which I would like to touch very, very briefly indeed, if I may be allowed to do so, is this: I am instructed to say in the view of the London Passengers' Association it is extremely difficult to get to the route or the heart of this extremely technical matter in proceedings such as these, which are virtually in a Court of Law, and are in fact in a Court of Law. The way that would best be done, in my clients' opinion, would be by means of some more flexible kind of inquiry; and a request that the Tribunal should put that view forward in their Judgment is contained in the Objection. Therefore my application is that the Tribunal should refuse to confirm this Scheme, and should put that recommendation in their Judgment.

(Mr. Wellum): If it is convenient I would like to address you for a few moments. I hope not to keep you very long. I represent the Benfleet and District Railway Travellers' Association, Benfleet Station being roughly the centre of the area I represent.

We object to the fare increases on three grounds. The first ground is that of hardship. I do not intend to go into that at any length; it has been covered already. I would emphasise that very many people, I could say the majority of the people living in the area, were attracted to it due to its healthy nature and the low fares between the area and London. Those people are now finding that their fares have been increased by a very great amount. In 1940 the first class season ticket, quarterly, was £5 13s. 3d.; it has now reached—and this is before the application of the present Scheme—£11 18s. 6d. I would submit, Sir, that that increase is over and above what the average man can afford.

(President): Is it much over and above the rise in the cost of a large number of other articles which the average man does in practice buy? It is very difficult to cast one's mind back to 1940, but my impression is that most things are more than 100 per cent. above the 1940 price.

(Mr. Wellum): As you will see, Sir, my knowledge of 1940 prices is also rather limited, but my memory certainly is that that is the outside rise, on the average. It is certainly above, I believe, the average increase of wages over the same period. If I had been in my present position in 1940 and comparing that with my present position now, I certainly would not have received 100 per cent. increase in pay.

The second point of our Objection is the absence of facilities for day-return fares both from Benfleet to

20 April, 1953]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE

[Continued]

Southend and Benfleet to London. The area of Benfleet and district covers the Urban District Councils of Benfleet and Canvey Island, neither of these two areas is particularly urban in nature, and neither of them has very much in the way of facilities, cultural, entertainment or shopping. Before the war there were cheap-day fares available in both directions.

(President): You come from there, and you are no doubt entitled to say it, but you are not saying there are no shopping facilities in Benfleet?

(Mr. Wellum): No, Sir, I say they are limited. In a small area of this kind you do not get large shops and therefore choice is extremely limited, and in some cases, for instance, furniture, there is no place to buy certain articles. I cannot recall any shop in Benfleet selling furniture. The absence of day tickets is thus a considerable hardship. The present position is that those desiring to go to London for shopping for the day, if they are fit and otherwise able go on an early morning ticket, thus travel during the rush hour. Otherwise they must pay the full fare or refrain from going. Many do refrain from going because they cannot afford the full fare or they do not see that it is a good fare to pay. They object to paying such a large amount and they do gather in parties either to go by coach or by car; others again do go by early morning fare.

It is the contention of my Association that if a cheap day ticket were re-instituted it would gain profit, it would attract those people now travelling by coach and probably, due to parking difficulties, by car. Those would be a gain to the British Transport Commission. There would also be a further gain to the Commission because people travelling by the early morning tickets do not find it convenient; thus a cheap day ticket priced above the early morning would be a gain to the Commission.

The third point of our Objection is that the service given on the line does not warrant an increase in fares. I do not intend to go into this at length. The line I think is sufficiently notorious already. It has been agreed that the line is profitable. I think, Sir Reginald Wilson's remark on it was that he was very grateful to the Southend line. The feelings of the passengers on this line, Sir, are that if the profits are there (and it is their belief that the profits on that line are considerable) the service given should be commensurate with those profits. The train service itself, it is agreed, has improved both in time-keeping and cleanliness in recent months, although on one morning recently we had a case of a train being stopped because it was suspected that the tail light was out, causing a delay of twenty minutes. During that time there was a light fall of snow; a fog service was instituted, and this was followed by four track failures, one black-out, two engine failures, and two points failures. I think this is truly remarkable on a short stretch of line.

Apart from the service given by the trains themselves, our contention is that service is very much lacking on the stations. For instance, I will give you three examples here, the only way of reaching the platforms at Fenchurch Street Station is by a minimum of two flights of stairs. There is no passenger lift. For the elderly or the infirm that is a very great hardship. There are many who cannot use Fenchurch Street Station for that reason. People do not feel, with that sort of difficulty, like travelling by train. Another small item, which is a good example of the things that happen on the Fenchurch Street line, is that the drinking fountain at Fenchurch Street Station has been out of action for about two years. Booking facilities at Benfleet Station are very poor. I understand that application was made to the Railway Company before the war, and applications have certainly been made to the Railway Executive since the war on more than one occasion, for an improvement in booking facilities.

(President): Do you mean that there are not many places in the booking office at which you can get your ticket?

(Mr. Wellum): Only one, Sir, and for early morning trains it is not unusual to get a queue of people waiting for tickets anything up to 75 or 100 yards long. Frequently people at the end of the queue travel without a ticket rather than miss the train. We have even had on occasion recently the complete absence of a booking clerk.

(President): At Fenchurch Street Station?

(Mr. Wellum): At Benfleet.

(President): Up to the moment you have been talking about Fenchurch Street?

(Mr. Wellum): No, Sir, I began on Benfleet with the bookings. Not only do people lose their trains, but when they get to Fenchurch Street they pay by means of the excess fare voucher, and they cannot then get their early morning ticket from Benfleet to the station they wish to reach if they wish to travel on the London Transport lines, thus they have to pay an extra to that which they would normally pay.

(President): Are you saying that often at Benfleet there is not anyone in the ticket office?

(Mr. Wellum): We have had it on more than one occasion. It has been brought to the notice of the Executive, and they say they are taking action, but I am pointing it out as one of the ways in which service has been lacking. Because of these many ways—I have just given you three examples for the sake of brevity—in which service is lacking people do not feel happy about paying an increase in fares. They do not feel happy that what they are already paying in fares is being used fully to their advantage, or sufficiently to their advantage. They realise that some lines are more profitable than others, and that those lines do have to make a contribution to the less profitable ones, but they do feel that on this line the amount of profit being taken out of the line is in excess of that which is fair and reasonable.

You will also see that we are asking you to rule that concessional tickets should be made available from Benfleet Station. I will not take up your time by arguing that type of point now. They were argued by Mr. Rougier yesterday, and we will shelter under his case.

I understand a further point made, governing regulations of refunding of season tickets, you have ruled to be not allowable at this time.

(President): I have not quite gone that length by saying it is not an allowable objection; I have said that even assuming we thought there was something in it we should be very reluctant to deal with only one of the conditions regulating season tickets, specially in the Scheme. It was suggested if there was anything in the point there is a perfectly proper way of bringing it before the Tribunal as a separate point and not in the course of a discussion of the Charges Scheme.

(Mr. Wellum): I see, then perhaps in that case you will take note of our objection.

(Mr. Halliday): I am Secretary of the North London District of the Bakers' Union. On behalf of the 2,000 members, and their wives and families, we protest against this proposed further increase in the fares.

Our members either finish work early in the morning, as many are night workers, or start work round about 6 o'clock in the morning or 7 o'clock. They have felt the full effect of the last increase. Their rate of wages under the Bakers' Wages Council is £6 8s. 9d. and for women it is £4 5s. 0d., and even where they are covered by a Trade Union Agreement, the rate is only £6 15s. 0d. for men and £4 15s. 0d. for women. Where a man is a night worker he is entitled to 10 per cent. extra payment.

The latest proposals, while admittedly relatively small in comparison with the effect of the last increases, do add a further burden upon the weekly budget of our members.

The average cost of transport to and from work has become too large a share of our members' expenses, and owing to the trend of development in our trade they are being compelled to travel farther to obtain work. This puts an added strain on their wages. For example, two of our members have given details of their travelling costs. One member travels from Southall to Willesden by early-morning and ordinary fare, and although his proposed increase is only 3d. per day, this would mean that his weekly transport costs now would be 15s. 6d. Another member travels from Tufnell Park to Barnet by tube; his fare is at present 1s. 5d. per day, and 8s. 6d. per week, but with the increase this will become 9s. 6d. That is only for members travelling to and from work; but their wives and families are being asked to face another increase in what is still a local shopping journey. This can only have the same result as before, less people will use the transport, they will be compelled to walk the

20 April, 1953]

The Rev. CYRIL EDWARD POCKNEE

[Continued]

extra journey beyond 2d. It has been stated that the result of the last increase in the fares was a drop in the number of people using the transport service, and while it is not possible for the majority of our members to use alternative means of transport, the situation is such that they only travel when it is unavoidable and necessary.

There is a reluctance of our members to take jobs which would add appreciably to their expenses, and with the trend of our trade being to centralise production, and the larger units are to be found on the outer part of London, it is a serious problem facing our members that with the decline of situations in central London they are compelled to travel further to reach these factories. This is becoming an increasing burden on the household economy.

With the recent experience of the taxi cabs quoted, where income dropped after an increase in fares, I do submit on behalf of our members, their wives and families, that instead of increasing fares if the London Transport Executive were to lower them and so make it possible for all who would like to use transport to do so, we are convinced the resulting increase in passengers would, more than any increase in fares, provide the necessary income to balance the cost of the service and solve the financial problems of the Executive. Instead of cutting out coaches on trains and gradually again saving car miles and bus miles, let the people who are using the pavements at present because of the high cost of travel, use the bus, the tube and train, as they once did and still want to do.

We maintain, Sir, that if these steps were considered and taken, the financial problems facing the Executive would certainly resolve themselves.

(President): Mr. Frankel, you are representing the National Union of Bank Employees?

(Mr. Frankel): That is correct; it has a membership of more than 10,000 in the London Area.

Giving evidence before the Transport Tribunal which sat on Tuesday, 20th November, 1951, to hear objections to the last Charges Scheme, my predecessor, Mr. Bernard, reviewed the character and economic position of those whom we both represent, namely, bank employees. I will not indulge in extensive repetition but recapitulate briefly the essential points made by him before I go on to speak against the new, proposed fares increases.

Briefly, then, bank employees range from men occupying posts of responsibility in head offices and branches of the banks, down the age scale to young girls and boys employed on routine, basic tasks. It is estimated that in the City of London alone 20,000 bank employees work. Most, and especially those who work in inner London, live some distance from their work, among the inner suburbs right out in many cases to Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Essex and Sussex. Nor are they able to move their homes to reduce travelling distances, for the banks encourage their male employees to buy their own houses which, due to the housing shortage as well as to the almost exclusive building of flats on the new, inner London estates, must of necessity be far out. Even those who work in outer London do not necessarily live near their bank branch, being often summarily and with inadequate compensation transferred elsewhere, with consequent increased daily travel.

Bank employees are prevented from halting the steady decline in their standards of living by the absence of full negotiating machinery with their employers, such as is general in most British industries and professions. They cannot, except on a very few occasions in the year, work overtime. They are expected to maintain a certain

standard of dress. On the whole, therefore, bank employees cannot avoid paying increased fares simply because they cannot avoid travelling; and we therefore feel that some provision should be made to prevent fares for needless travel on a public utility from pursuing an upward spiral.

My predecessor at the last Tribunal said rightly that bank employees were really completely at the mercy of the Transport Commission. He estimated that, if the Commission's proposals were endorsed by the Tribunal, there would be a migration of younger staff (who are more easily able to leave) out of banking and particularly out of the large head offices. I think it is of some importance to see if this estimate was borne out by subsequent events.

I would like to draw the Tribunal's attention to the numbers of those who were struck off membership of my Union because they had left banking. In the six months March to August, 1951, 514 were so struck off. In the same period last year the number was 504. But at the end of 1951 and the beginning of 1952 the mass resignations of younger staff had compelled the banks to introduce improved salary scales. The figures thus show that the new salary scales in fact made no difference to the position of bank employees, since they continued to leave the service at roughly the same rate. I would strongly suggest that the increases of approximately 20 per cent. in season ticket rates last spring contributed to this significant fact.

Most of those leaving banking have in fact been young people; but for those older bank employees who cannot easily leave, the situation, as I shall show, is far more serious. The banks had been paying, since 1947, cash payments as percentages of basic salary. By 1951 the so-called Big Seven banks were paying 27½ per cent. of basic salary. In spring, 1952, as I have already mentioned, salaries were revised. For the over-32s, however, total remuneration increased by as little as 2 per cent. to 6½ per cent., except for managers, who did rather better. If his remuneration rose by the average of 4 per cent., an older man who received, say, £700 in 1951, obtained in 1952 only £28 more. Out of this, owing to last year's increased charges, he had to pay—if, say, he lived 20 miles away—£6 13s. more in fares, almost one quarter of the whole rise in remuneration.

As is well known, fares were not the only prices to rise last year. The cost of living index, which stood in March, 1952, at 132/133, rose to 138 three months later. Thus the meagre increases in pay for the thousands of bank men and women over 32 were more than swallowed up. They simply cannot, I repeat, readily leave their employment, easily change their home, or, in the absence of adequate negotiating machinery, bargain with their employers for higher pay. That they are completely at the mercy of such bodies as the Transport Commission and are suffering thereby is, I submit, unquestionable.

The present, proposed increases in season ticket rates are of the order of 5 per cent. for 10 miles, 3 per cent. for 20 miles and 2 per cent. for 30 miles. I have to inform the Tribunal that salary and wage increases for 1953 for the over-32s have been very sparse indeed. Total remuneration in almost every instance is precisely the same as last year's. Any increase in fares, particularly season ticket rates, will intensify still further the difficulties of these, among the most loyal of all British working people. In view of the coming rise in food prices I would urge the Tribunal to bear the people for whom I speak strongly in mind and somehow so amend the Scheme that bank men and women shall not continue to suffer a more and more onerous burden.

(Adjourned until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning.)

20 April, 1953]

[Continued]

CORRIGENDA

FOURTH DAY—TUESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1953

Page 52, Question 415, line 1—for “and” read “have”.

EIGHTEENTH DAY—WEDNESDAY, 15TH APRIL, 1953

Page 381, Question 6559, line 2—for “of the Associated” read “an Associate of the”.

Page 383, Question 6615, line 5—for “altered” read “unaltered”.

NINETEENTH DAY—THURSDAY, 16TH APRIL, 1953

Page 388, Question 6646, last line—for “net” read “not”.

Page 389, Question 6714, line 7—for “sub-fare-stages” read “fare-stages” and for “longer by” read “Longer than”.

Page 390, Question 6714, penultimate line—for “for ls. 4d.” read “of 1·41d.”.

Page 390, Question 6714, penultimate line—for “longer” read “lower”.

Page 390, Question 6724, last line—for “after” read “without”.

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE